Tseng, Antony

From: Hirst, Barbara <Barbara.Hirst@dep.state.nj.us>
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 10:51 AM
To: Nyman, Robert; Angus Eaton
Cc: Jeff Myers; Tseng, Antony
Subject: RE: timeframe for model training

Okay here.

From: Nyman, Robert [mailto:Nyman.Robert@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 10:19 AM
To: Hirst, Barbara; Angus Eaton
Cc: Jeff Myers; Tseng, Antony
Subject: RE: timeframe for model training

Angus/Barbara,

So if we shoot for a late January/February training and follow up support for Feb, March, April and May, your both OK?

Bob

From: Hirst, Barbara [mailto:Barbara.Hirst@dep.state.nj.us]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 3:48 PM
To: Nyman, Robert; Angus Eaton
Cc: Hirst, Barbara
Subject: RE: timeframe for model training

In a nutshell, given our many priorities and holidays the end of the year, we prefer that the training session be scheduled for end of January or sometime in February. Also, we know the number of support hours is fixed, but need some flexibility on the window (more than one month; more on the order of 3 months) during which they can be accessed for several reasons, in addition to the fact that once the model is received, it is unlikely that staff would be able to devote 100% of their time to testing their ability to use the model. Staff thoughts in this regard are provided below:

1. We do not know how in-depth the training will be. If HDR gave us all the codes that SWEM inputs needs, it would be easier. And, as Robin indicated during the conference call with HEP and NYS, they may modify the tool as necessary to address our needs and they may take time in doing so and then we will have to test the modifications and may have new questions.
2. Installing the software to mimic HDR's LINUX environment may take some time.
3. Since some of the scenarios that we were hoping to run included relocation of outfall or reducing or eliminating flows from outfalls, we will have to run SWEM hydrodynamic model. In order to do that, I will have to run the hydrodynamic model for SWEM on the machines here at NJDEP and make sure that the results are being reproduced since the last time SWEM hydro was actually run was more than a decade ago and the processors have changed significantly. My prior experience at HydroQual with ECOM and RCA indicates that if the type of processor is changed, the hydro results tend to change, specially the mixing patterns. This will take at least a few weeks.

From: Nyman, Robert [mailto:Nyman.Robert@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 25, 2013 3:31 PM

To: Angus Eaton; Hirst, Barbara
Subject: RE: timeframe for model training

Any thoughts?

From: Nyman, Robert
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 11:34 AM
To: Angus Eaton; 'Hirst, Barbara'
Cc: Antony Tseng; Richard Balla
Subject: timeframe for model training

Angus/Barbara,

As you may know, NEIWPCC holds the contract with HDR HydroQual for the model training that you have been discussing with Antony Tseng. NEIWPCC needs to extend their contract with HDR and is interested in knowing generally when the one day training would take place, and for what period of time afterwards the states would like to have access to HDR for follow up. I can set up a Doodle poll for the training if you can agree on a general timeframe (e.g. training in early December, late January, etc). There is a set $ amount for the follow up support - would one month be appropriate for that?

Thanks, Bob

Robert Nyman
New York-New Jersey Harbor & Estuary Program
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
290 Broadway, 24th Floor
New York, NY 10007
212-637-3809